

buck stops here." It is the job of the Congress to make sure that the Nation's insurance policy is paid in full and that we have an adequate, fully trained properly educated, well-equipped, and highly motivated military.

This Congress should heed the necessity to fully fund the Bottom-Up Review, which is designed to successfully fight two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously; to maintain a high level of readiness; to give adequate pay raises to uniformed personnel; to allow our forces to have the quality of life they so well deserve; and to have continued modernization of equipment and weapons systems.

I say to you, Members of this distinguished organization: Your visits to Capitol Hill, and communications with Members of Congress, are extremely important. Never underestimate the impact of your presence as Congress debates our national defense policy. When the history of this new post-cold-war era is written, I hope the history books will say that the Americans in uniform stood tall and had the strong support of the Congress of the United States.

Let me share with you a magic, memorable moment from yesteryear. I remember it so clearly. I was 9 years of age, attending the fifth grade at Central School in Lexington. My father, a veteran of the First World War, trial lawyer, and well-known orator in Lafayette County, was invited to speak at the Armistice Day ceremonies at the Odessa High School, just a few miles from Lexington. That was November 11, 1941. He took me from my class and we drove to the Odessa High School, where I sat in the back of the student body, listening and watching the Armistice Day program. On the stage, students portraying soldiers were dressed in World War uniforms, and the beating of a bass drum simulated artillery fire.

Then my father gave his speech. He told of the freedoms of America, and how those in uniform had defended our country through the years. He also stated that there were those in that audience who might well have to defend our freedoms once again. How prophetic he was, for less than a month later, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and our Nation was engulfed in what became known as World War II. Two young men from that Odessa graduating class of May, 1942 were killed in action.

My father concluded his speech to the student body by reciting—

"In Flanders Fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie,
In Flanders Fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Fields."

Let those inscriptions on the crosses of Flanders Field be more than forgotten names. Let those men be remembered for their patriotism, courage, and dedication. Let those citizen soldiers who lie there ever cause us to remember that we, in our day and time, have the duty to hold high the touch of freedom in this dangerous and unstable world.

Thank you, and God bless you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.].

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for Members attention the following letter from myself and the chairman of the Committee on National Security, Mr. SPENCE, regarding jurisdiction.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 1995

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As Chairmen of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on National Security, we wanted to advise you of our mutual agreement concerning the division of jurisdiction over the merchant marine due to the dissolution of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Rule X, clause 1(k) of the Rules of the House for the 104th Congress provides jurisdiction to the Committee on National Security over:

"(7) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, the maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference, and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security."

The new Rule X, clause 1(q) provides the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with jurisdiction over:

"(12) Measures relating to merchant marine, except for national security aspects of merchant marine."

This split in jurisdiction in what was previously entirely within the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is based on the fact that, while various aspects of the merchant marine and related activities are transportation matters that are handled in the executive branch by the Department of Transportation, certain aspects are so closely tied to national security that primary jurisdiction should be within the Committee on National Security. For example, the maintenance and control of the National Defense Reserve Fleet and the Ready Reserve Fleet would be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security.

However, it may not be clear in all cases to which of the two Committees a particular bill should be referred. In general, matters relating to merchant marine activities will be referred to the National Security Committee if the national security aspects of the matter predominate over transportation and other merchant marine aspects.

While present programs of the Maritime Administration have both national security and transportation implications, we agree

that primary jurisdiction over the annual authorization for the Maritime Administration would be in the Committee on National Security. Primary jurisdiction over the annual authorization for the Federal Maritime Commission would be in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Shipbuilding is a subject that has a particularly strong connection with national security because of the implications for our defense industrial base. We agree that the National Shipbuilding Initiative, including the loan guarantee program under Title XI, would be within the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security. In addition, the Congress likely will be requested to approve legislation to implement an international agreement to eliminate shipbuilding subsidies worldwide. While this is generally a laudable goal, the contents of this agreement must be examined in the context of its long-term effect on the shipbuilding industrial base. Of particular concern is the question of whether U.S.-based shipyards are disadvantaged by this agreement to the point that a transition from naval construction to commercial construction is impossible. We agree that, as between the Committees on National Security and Transportation and Infrastructure, primary jurisdiction over implementing legislation for this agreement should reside with the Committee on National Security.

Jurisdiction over the State and Federal Maritime Training Academies is granted in the rule specifically to the Committee on National Security. With respect to the provision in Rule X, clause 1(k)(9) concerning merchant marine officers and seamen, it is understood that measures whose predominant purpose is the maintenance of a well trained merchant mariner manpower pool capable of meeting sustainment and surge sealift requirements will be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security. Shortages of qualified U.S. mariners to serve during the mobilization for Desert Storm highlighted the need to consider these problems from a national security standpoint.

Jurisdiction over the Coast Guard is provided to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by Rule X, clause 1(q)(1). This confers upon the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee authority over all matters handled by the Coast Guard that were previously within the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

This letter may not address all merchant marine issues that will come before you. We will continue to work with you toward resolution of other issues as they arise.

Finally, it is understood that this agreement does not in any way alter or limit the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or of the Committee on National Security over matters discussed herein which were properly within the respective Committees' jurisdiction prior to the dissolution of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee
on National Security.

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee
on Transportation
and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHABOT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

GOPAC AND ITS ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN TO END THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for recognizing me for 1 hour under the special order of business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in 1984 our Speaker published a book entitled "Window of Opportunity." I would like to quote from Speaker GINGRICH's book in reference to political action committees, as follows:

As a citizen you need to keep track of your elected officials' promises and their actual behavior. I strongly favor PAC's because they tie candidates' promises to their performances by keeping records more effectively than do individuals. By linking their contributions to performance in areas of interest to the contributors, the PAC system encourages more people to be involved because it makes their contributions and their endorsement more effective.

Let me quote again from Speaker GINGRICH's book of 1984: "This proliferation of open publicly registered and publicly monitored support is in the best tradition of participatory democracy."

That observation is especially timely in light of two publications this weekend. On Sunday, in the Denver Post, there was a question raised about the Speaker's personal PAC, GOPAC, and links with the cable television industry.

Today in the Los Angeles Times is another article raising a question about the same PAC, GOPAC, which is Speaker GINGRICH's PAC, and why they have refused, those who are running the PAC and the Speaker, to make a full disclosure of all the contributors to the PAC. Some of the contributors to the \$7 million political action committee have been disclosed. For example, one Wisconsin couple, Terry and Mary Kohler, of Sheboygan, WI, have been disclosed as having contributed \$715,000 to Speaker GINGRICH's political action committee between 1985 and 1993. That is nearly twice the amount that they could have legally donated directly to all Federal candidates.

This \$7 million political action committee which the Speaker has not disclosed in detail also includes executives and lobbyists for seven companies regulated by the Food and Drug Administration. These executives, the seven that are named in the Los Angeles Times article, are among, in their words, "GOPAC's heavy hitters."

So, Mr. Speaker, we have an unusual situation here where the Speaker of the House in 1984 had called for public monitoring and public registration of

those who were involved in political action committees and then, beginning a year later, with the creation of GOPAC, the GOP Action Committee, there has been a refusal of that same Speaker to make this information known to the public.

Those who are listening might ask a very basic question. So what? What difference does it make? Why should the Speaker have to disclose the names of his contributors to this \$7 million political action committee and the expenses and disbursements that were made by that political action committee?

I think it gets back to a point the Speaker made in his book. This is a way to make sure that there is accountability and, in his words, "in the best tradition of participatory democracy."

Those who have been following the news lately know that the Speaker has not been unsparing in his criticism of the Food and Drug Administration. I have some familiarity with this agency. It is one which is funded by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which I chaired over the last 2 years. By Federal standards it is a pretty small agency. We appropriate about \$1 billion a year to the Food and Drug Administration and give them an awesome responsibility. We say to this small agency, "Make sure as best as humanly possible that every drug, every medical device, and many of the foods that come into the households of American families are not only safe to be used but in fact can be used for their stated purpose effectively."

That is a big task, and when you consider the giants of American industry that watch closely over this small agency, it is no wonder that from time to time they come under criticism. In fact, in years gone by much of that criticism has been warranted. The agency fell behind in drug approvals, in medical-device approvals, and in other areas of responsibility. I am happy to report, though, that over the last several years, under the leadership of Dr. Kessler, who is the only holdover from the Bush administration serving under President Clinton as the head of the Food and Drug Administration as well, remarkable progress has been made in the Food and Drug Administration. In fact, they have come up with a much more expedited schedule for the approval of drugs and medical devices, something which every American and every American family wants to see.

But despite this, some of the critics of the Food and Drug Administration are running advertisements now suggesting that we should turn out the lights and close the door on the Food and Drug Administration. They have suggested that it has too much power. In the words of one of their critics, they have been characterized as "thugs."

Stepping aside from this type of lurid rhetoric and looking at the fact, I think that it is critically important that the Food and Drug Administra-

tion maintain its independence, not only for its credibility within its own industry but for its credibility in helping American industry. Let me give two specific examples of what I am talking about.

Most Americans can recall that not too long ago we had a scare when people discovered hypodermic syringes in the cans of Diet Pepsi. That was a little over a year ago. As a result of that scare, a couple of these syringes popped up across the United States and people were genuinely concerned about this product and its safety. As a result of that scare, Pepsi Cola stock plummeted in value because of the concern as to whether this scare might have some impact on their sales. In step, the Food and Drug Administration conducted a quick and thorough investigation, reported to the American people that it was a hoax that was being copycatted by others around the country, and within a very short period of time this scare was gone. Pepsi Cola stock started to rebound. People were buying the product without concern for its safety. Why? Because of the credibility of this independent Federal agency, an agency which is not beholden to anyone in industry but is only beholden to taxpayers and consumers.

Let me give a second example. In my part of the world, in the Midwestern United States, there is a distributor of frozen-food products known as Schwan Foods. This is an unusual operation to most other parts of the country because they usually drive refrigerated trucks around the Midwest and sell frozen foods door to door to their loyal subscribers. They sell everything from ice cream to frozen meats and all sorts of other frozen foods for homemakers in my part of the world.

A few months ago there was a scare over some of the ice cream which they sold which appeared contaminated. It hit all the newspapers. There was a genuine fear that Schwan's as a company would not be able to survive because of this disclosure. In came the Food and Drug Administration. They conducted an investigation of their operation. They found what they considered to be the cause of the problem and suggested to the Schwan food company what they could do to ameliorate the situation and to allay any fears of consumers. Their trucks are still on the road today. Schwan's is still doing business. It appears now the Food and Drug Administration has come in and added credibility to the situation and helped this company get back on its feet.

Despite these examples, we still have people calling for an end to the Food and Drug Administration. Some of them will be companies, which, quite frankly, do not like to see this type of Government regulation, a regulation which requires that their advertising of their products be truthful, that what they say the products will do they can